arXiv:1602.01782v1 [math.GN] 4 Feb 2016

COFINITE CONNECTEDNESS AND COFINITE GROUP ACTIONS

AMRITA ACHARYYA, JON M. CORSON, AND BIKASH DAS

Abstract. We have defined and established a theory of cofinite connectedness of a cofinite graph. Many of the properties of connectedness of topological spaces have analogs for cofinite connectedness. We have seen that if G is a cofinite group and $\Gamma = \Gamma(G, X)$ is the Cayley graph. Then Γ can be given a suitable cofinite uniform topological structure so that X generates G, topologically iff Γ is cofinitely connected.

Our immediate next concern is developing group actions on cofinite graphs. Defining the action of an abstract group over a cofinite graph in the most natural way we are able to characterize a unique way of uniformizing an abstract group with a cofinite structure, obtained from the cofinite structure of the graph in the underlying action, so that the afore said action becomes uniformly continuous.

1. Introduction

A cofinite graph Γ is said to be *cofinitely connected* if for each compatible cofinite equivalence relation R on Γ, the quotient graph Γ/R is path connected.

Similar to the standard connectedness arguements for finite graphs or general topological spaces we were able to establish that the following statements are equivalent for any cofinite graph Γ:

(1) Γ is cofinitely connected;
(2) Γ is not the union of two disjoint nonempty subgraphs.

As an immediate consequence we obtained the following generalized characterization of connected Cayley graphs of cofinite groups:

Let G be a cofinite group and let $\Gamma = \Gamma(G, X)$ be the Cayley graph. Then Γ can be given a suitable cofinite topological graph structure so that X generates G (topologically) iff Γ is cofinitely connected.

Our final section is concerned with cofinite group actions on cofinite graphs.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C63, 54F65, 57M15, 20E18.

Key words and phrases. profinite graph, cofinite graph, profinite group, cofinite group, uniform space, completion, cofinite entourage, Caley graph, group action, cofinite connectedness.

A group G is said to act uniformly equicontinuously over a cofinite graph Γ if and only if for each entourage W over Γ there exists an entourage V over Γ such that for all g in $G, (g \times g)[V] \subseteq W$. In this case the group action induces a (Hausdorff) cofinite uniformity over G if and only if the aforesaid action is faithful.

We say that a group G acts on a cofinite graph Γ residually freely, if there exists a fundamental system of G-invariant compatible cofinite entourages R over Γ such that the induced group action of G/N_R over Γ/R is a free action, where N_R is the Kernel of the action of G on Γ/R.

Suppose that G is a group acting faithfully and uniformly equicontinuously on a cofinite graph Γ, then the action $G \times \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is uniformly continuous. Also in that case $\widehat{G}$ acts on $\widehat{\Gamma}$ uniformly equicontinuously.

2. Connected Cofinite Graphs

A *path* in a graph Γ is a finite string of edges $p = e_1 \cdots e_n \in E(\Gamma)^*$ such that $t(e_i) = s(e_{i+1})$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. The *source* and *target* of this path p are the vertices $s(p) = s(e_1)$ and $t(p) = t(e_n)$. We say that Γ is *path connected* if there is a path in Γ joining any two vertices.

Definition 2.1. A cofinite graph Γ is *cofinitely connected* if for each compatible cofinite equivalence relation R on Γ, the quotient graph Γ/R is path connected.

Proposition 2.2. *The following statements are equivalent for any cofinite graph* Γ*:*

1. Γ *is cofinitely connected;*
2. Γ *is not the uniform sum of two disjoint nonempty subgraphs. We then note that if* Γ *is a profinite graph then we can restate the condition as* Γ *is not the disjoint union of two nonempty closed subgraphs.*
3. *the completion* $\overline{\Gamma}$ *of* Γ *is cofinitely connected.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): If possible, let us assume that Γ is the uniform sum of two disjoint subgraphs Γ_1 and Γ_2. Let R_{Γ_1} be a compatible cofinite entourage over Γ_1 and S_{Γ_2} be another compatible cofinite entourage over Γ_2. Then $W = R_{\Gamma_1} \cup S_{\Gamma_2}$ is a compatible cofinite entourage over Γ. Moreover Γ/W is not path connected, a contradiction.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3): If possible, let us assume that $\overline{\Gamma}$ is not cofinitely connected. Hence there exists a compatible cofinite entourage W over $\overline{\Gamma}$ such that $\overline{\Gamma}/W$ is not path connected.

Let Σ be a path connected component of $\overline{\Gamma}/W$. Hence Σ is a subgraph of $\overline{\Gamma}/W$ and thus $(\overline{\Gamma}/W) \setminus \Sigma$ is a subgraph of $\overline{\Gamma}/W$ as well. Let $\Gamma_1 = \varphi^{-1}(\Sigma)$ and $\Gamma_2 = \varphi^{-1}(\overline{\Gamma} \setminus \Sigma)$, where $\varphi \colon \overline{\Gamma} \to \overline{\Gamma}/W$ is the

canonical quotient map. Then Γ_1, Γ_2 are closed subgraphs of $\overline{\Gamma}$ such that $\overline{\Gamma}$ is equal to the disjoint union of two closed subgraphs of $\overline{\Gamma}$ and then $\overline{\Gamma}$ is equal to the uniform sum of two disjoint subgraphs of $\overline{\Gamma}$, a contradiction.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1): If possible assume that Γ is not cofinitely connected. Then there exists a cofinite entourage R over Γ such that Γ/R is not path connected. But, $\overline{R}$ is a compatible cofinite entourage over $\overline{\Gamma}$ such that Γ/R is graph isomorphic to $\overline{\Gamma}/\overline{R}$. Hence $\overline{\Gamma}/\overline{R}$ is not path connected as well, a contradiction. □

Many of the properties of connectedness of topological spaces have analogs for cofinite connectedness. Next we list a few of them.

Proposition 2.3. *Let Γ be a cofinite graph and let Σ be a uniform subgraph.*

1. *If Σ is path connected, then it is also cofinitely connected.*
2. *If Σ is cofinitely connected, then so is the cofinite subgraph $\overline{\Sigma}$.*
3. *If Σ is cofinitely connected and $f\colon \Gamma \to \Delta$ a uniformly continuous map of graphs, then $f(\Sigma)$ is also cofinitely connected (as a cofinite subgraph of Δ).*

Proof. Note that Σ is a also a cofinite graph

1. If Σ is path connected then any quotient graph of Σ is path connected as well and thus our claim follows.
2. We will first see that $\overline{\Sigma} = \overline{V(\Sigma) \cup E(\Sigma)} = \overline{V(\Sigma)} \cup \overline{E(\Sigma)}$ and that equals $V(\overline{\Sigma}) \cup E(\overline{\Sigma})$ and thus is a cofinite subgraph of Γ as well. Now, if possible suppose $\overline{\Sigma} = \Sigma_1 \coprod \Sigma_2$, where Σ_1, Σ_2 are two disjoint nonempty cofinite subgraphs of $\overline{\Sigma}$. Then $\Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma, \Sigma_2 \cap \Sigma$ are two disjoint connected cofinite subgraphs of Σ. Let R_1, R_2 be two compatible cofinite entourage over $\Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma, \Sigma_2 \cap \Sigma$ respectively. Then there exist two compatible cofinite entourages $\tilde{R_1}, \tilde{R_2}$ over Σ_1, Σ_2 respectively such that $R_1 \supseteq \tilde{R_1} \cap (\Sigma \times \Sigma)$ and R_2 contains $\tilde{R_2} \cap (\Sigma \times \Sigma)$. But as $\tilde{R_1} \cup \tilde{R_2}$ is a compatible cofinite entourage over $\overline{\Sigma}$, then $(\tilde{R_1} \cup \tilde{R_2}) \cap (\Sigma \times \Sigma)$ is equal to $\tilde{R_1} \cap (\Sigma \times \Sigma) \cup \tilde{R_2} \cap (\Sigma \times \Sigma)$ which is a subset of $R_1 \cup R_2$. So $R_1 \cup R_2$ is a compatible entourage over Σ. Hence $\Sigma = (\Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma) \coprod (\Sigma_2 \cap \Sigma)$. Now suppose $\Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$. Then $\Sigma \subseteq \Sigma_2$. However Σ_2 is closed in $\overline{\Sigma}$ and hence closed in Γ. Thus $\overline{\Sigma} \subseteq \Sigma_2$ and therefore $\Sigma_1 = \emptyset$, a contradiction. Thus $\overline{\Sigma}$ is cofinitely connected.
3. Let S be a compatible cofinite entourage over $f(\Sigma)$. Then as $f|_\Sigma\colon \Sigma \to f(\Sigma)$ is uniformly continuous there is a compatible

cofinite entourage R over Σ such that $R \subseteq (f \times f)^{-1}[S]$. Let us define $g\colon \Sigma/R \to f(\Sigma)/S$ via $g(R[a]) = S[f(a)]$, for all $a \in \Sigma$. Now if $R[a] = R[b]$, then $(a, b) \in R$. Hence $(f(a), f(b))$ is in S which implies that $S[f(a)] = S[f(b)]$. Therefore g is well defined and as f is a map of graphs and both of Σ/R, $f(\Sigma)/S$ are discrete, g is a surjective uniformly continuous map of graphs. Since Σ/R is path connected then so is $g(\Sigma/R) = f(\Sigma)/S$.

□

3. Cofinite Groups and their Cayley Graphs

Definition 3.1. *Let G be an abstract group and $X = \{*\} \dot\cup E(X)$ be an abstract graph such that there is a map of sets $\alpha\colon X \to G$ with $\alpha(*) = 1_G$, $(\alpha(e))^{-1} = \alpha(\overline{e})$, for all $e \in E(X)$. Then the Cayley Graph $\Gamma(G, X)$ is defined as follows:*

(1) $V(\Gamma(G, X)) = G \times \{*\}, E(\Gamma(G, X)) = G \times E(X)$.
(2) $s(g, e) = (g, *)$, $t(g, e) = (g\alpha(e), *)$, $\overline{(g, e)} = (g\alpha(e), \overline{e})$.

Thus it follows that

(1) $\Gamma(G, X) = V(\Gamma(G, X)) \dot\cup E(\Gamma(G, X))$.
(2) $s, t, \overline{\ }$ are well defined and $t(\overline{(g, e)}) = t(g\alpha(e), \overline{e}) = (g\alpha(e)\alpha(\overline{e}), *)$ $= (g\alpha(e)\alpha(e)^{-1}), *) = (g, *) = s(g, e)$; $s(\overline{(g, e)}) = s(g\alpha(e), \overline{e})$ $= (g\alpha(e), *) = t(g, e)$.
(3) If possible, let $(g, e) = \overline{(g, e)} = ((g\alpha(e), \overline{e})$ and thus $e = \overline{e}$, a contradiction. Finally, $\overline{\overline{(g, e)}} = \overline{(g\alpha(e), \overline{e})}$ $= (g\alpha(e)\alpha(\overline{e}), \overline{\overline{e}}) = (g\alpha(e)\alpha(e)^{-1}), e) = (g, e)$. Hence $\Gamma(G, X)$ is indeed a graph.

We say that $\alpha\colon X \to G$ generates G algebraically if $\langle \alpha(X) \rangle = G$. Equivalently, $\alpha\colon X \to G$ generates G algebraically if the unique extension to $\alpha\colon E(X)^* \to G$ is onto.

Lemma 3.2. *The Cayley graph $\Gamma(G, X)$ is path connected if and only if $\alpha\colon X \to G$ generates G algebraically.*

Definition 3.3. *Let G be a cofinite group and $X = \{*\} \dot\cup E(X)$ be a cofinite graph such that there is a uniform continuous map of spaces $\alpha\colon X \to G$ with $\alpha(*) = 1_G$, $(\alpha(e))^{-1} = \alpha(\overline{e})$, for all $e \in E(X)$. Then the cofinite Cayley Graph $\Gamma(G, X)$ is defined as follows:*

(1) $V(\Gamma(G, X)) = G \times \{*\}, E(\Gamma(G, X)) = G \times E(X)$.
(2) $s(g, e) = (g, *)$, $t(g, e) = (g\alpha(e), *)$, $\overline{(g, e)} = (g\alpha(e), \overline{e})$.

$\Gamma(G, X)$ is endowed with the product uniform topological structure obtained from $G \times X = G \times V(\Gamma(G, X)) \dot\cup G \times E(\Gamma(G, X))$.

We have already seen that $\Gamma(G,X)$ is an abstract graph. Also being the product of Hausdorff, cofinite spaces, $\Gamma(G,X)$ is a Hausdorff, cofinite space as well. So in order to check that $\Gamma(G,X)$ is a cofinite graph it remains to prove that the compatible cofinite entourages over $\Gamma(G,X)$ forms a fundamental system of entourages. So it suffices to show that the family of cofinite entourages of the form $R \times S$, where R is a cofinite congruence over G and S is a compatible cofinite entourage over X such that $(\alpha \times \alpha)[S] \subseteq R$ forms a fundamental system of entourages.

To establish the above claim let us first see that the cofinite entourages of the form $R \times S$ are indeed compatible.

(1) Let $((x,y),(p,q)) \in R \times S$. So $(x,p) \in R \subseteq G \times G$ and (y,q) is in S. Thus either $(y,q) \in S_V$ or $(y,q) \in S_E$ which implies that $y = * = q$ or $(y,q) \in S_E$. Hence $(x,y),(p,q) \in V(\Gamma(G,X))$ or $(x,y),(p,q) \in E(\Gamma(G,X))$. Hence $R \times S \subseteq (R \times S)_V \dot{\cup} (R \times S)_E$. The other direction of the inclusion follows more immediately.
(2) Let $((g_1,e_1),(g_2,e_2)) \in R \times S$. Then $(g_1,g_2) \in R$ and (e_1,e_2) is in S. This implies that $(\alpha \times \alpha)(e_1,e_2) = (\alpha(e_1),\alpha(e_2)) \in R$ and $(\overline{e_1},\overline{e_2}) \in S$. Hence $(g_1\alpha(e_1),\ g_2\alpha(e_2)) \in R$, which implies $((g_1,*),(g_2,*))$ and $((g_1\alpha(e_1),*),(g_2\alpha(e_2),*))$ as well as $((g_1\alpha(e_1),\overline{e_1}),(g_2\alpha(e_2)\overline{e_2}))$ is in $R \times S$. Hence $(s(g_1,e_1),s(g_2,e_2))$, $(t(g_1,e_1),t(g_2,e_2))$ and $(\overline{(g_1,e_1)},\ \overline{(g_2,e_2)}) \in R \times S$.
(3) If possible let $(\overline{(g_1,e_1)},(g_1,e_1)) \in R \times S$ so $((g_1\alpha(e_1),\overline{e_1}),(g_1,e_1))$ is in $R \times S$. Thus $(\overline{e_1},e_1) \in S$, a contradiction.

Now let $R \times T$ be any cofinite entourage over $G \times X$. Note that since α is uniformly continuous and R is a cofinite congruence over G, T is a cofinite entourage over X, $(\alpha \times \alpha)^{-1}[R] \cap T$ is a cofinite entourage over X and $(\alpha \times \alpha)[(\alpha \times \alpha)^{-1}[R] \cap T] \subseteq R$. So in particular one can take S to be a compatible cofinite entourage over X such that $S \subseteq (\alpha \times \alpha)^{-1}[R] \cap T$. Then $(\alpha \times \alpha)[S] \subseteq R$ and $R \times S \subseteq R \times T$. This proves that $\Gamma(G,X)$ is a cofinite graph. We say that $\alpha\colon X \to G$ generates G topologically if $\overline{\langle \alpha(X) \rangle} = G$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\Gamma = \Gamma(G,X)$ be the cofinite Cayley graph. α from X to G generates G topologically iff Γ is cofinitely connected.*

Proof. Let us first assume that $\alpha\colon X \to G$ topologically generates G and let T be a compatible cofinite entourage over Γ, say T is equal to $R \times S$ where R is a cofinite congruence over G and S is a compatible cofinite entourage over X where $S \subseteq (\alpha \times \alpha)^{-1}[R]$. Let us define $\alpha_{RS}\colon X/S \to G/R$ via $\alpha_{RS}(S[x]) = R[\alpha(x)]$. Clearly, α_{RS} is well defined and $\alpha_{RS}(S[*]) = R[1_G]$ and $\alpha_{RS}(\overline{S[e]}) = R[\alpha(\overline{e})] = R[(\alpha(e))^{-1}]$

$= (R[\alpha(e)])^{-1} = (\alpha_{RS}(S[e]))^{-1}$, for all $S[e] \in E(X/S)$. Let us now see that $\Gamma/T \cong \Gamma(G/R, X/S)$. Define $\theta\colon \Gamma/T \to \Gamma(G/R, X/S)$ via $\theta(T[(g,x)]) = (R[g], S[x])$ for all x in X and all g in G. Clearly, it is well defined injection as $T[(h,y)] = T[(g,x)]$ if and only if $((h,y),(g,x)) \in T$ if and only if $(h,g) \in R, (y,x) \in S$ if and only if $R[h] = R[g]$ and $S[x] = S[y]$ if and only if $(R[h], S[y]) = (R[g], S[x])$. Also for all $(R[g], S[x]) \in \Gamma(G/R, X/S)$, there exists $T[(g,x)] \in \Gamma/T$ such that $\theta(T[(g,x)]) = (R[g], S[x])$. Moreover it can easily be seen that θ is a map of graphs as $\theta(T[(g,*)])$ which is equal to $(R[g], S[*])$ belongs to $V(\Gamma(G/R, X/S))$ and $\theta(T[(g,e)])$ which equals to $(R[g], S[e])$ belongs to $E(\Gamma(G/R, X/S))$. Further more for all $(T[(g,e)])$ in $E(\Gamma/T)$ we see that $\theta(s(T[(g,e)])) = \theta(T[s(g,e)])$ which also equals to $\theta(T[(g,*)])$ equal to $(R[g], S[*])$ and that equals to $s(R[g], S[e])$. We also notice that $\theta(t(T[(g,e)])) = \theta(T[t(g,e)]) = \theta(T[(g\alpha(e),*)]) = (R[g\alpha(e)], S[*])$ which we know is equal to $(R[g]R[\alpha(e)], \overline{S[*]}) = (R[g]\alpha_{RS}(\overline{S[e]}), S[*])$ and that is equal to $t(R[g], S[e])$ Finally, $\theta(\overline{(T[(g,e)]}) = \theta(T[\overline{(g,e)}])$ and that equals $\theta(T[(g\alpha(e), \overline{e})]) = (R[g\alpha(e)], S[\overline{e}])$ which can be written as $(R[g]R[\alpha(e)], \overline{S[\overline{e}]}) = (R[g]\alpha_{RS}(S[e]), S[\overline{e}]) = (R[g]\alpha_{RS}(S[e]), \overline{S[e]})$ and that equals $(R[g], S[e])$. Since $\Gamma/T, \Gamma(G/R, X/S)$ are discrete cofinite graphs, our claim follows.

Now we wish to prove that $\langle \alpha_{RS}(X/S) \rangle = G/R$. Let $R[g] \in G/R$. Then as $\overline{\langle \alpha(X) \rangle} = G$, we have $R[g] \cap \langle \alpha(X) \rangle \neq \emptyset$. Let $a \in R[g] \cap \langle \alpha(X) \rangle$. So, $R[g] = R[a]$. Also, since $a \in \langle \alpha(X) \rangle$, $a = \alpha(e_1)\alpha(e_2)\cdots\alpha(e_n)$, for some $e_1, e_2, \cdots, e_n \in E(X)$. Hence $R[a] = R[\alpha(e_1)]R[\alpha(e_2)]\cdots R[\alpha(e_n)]$, and one can represent this as $\alpha_{RS}(S[e_1])\alpha_{RS}(S[e_1])\cdots\alpha_{RS}(S[e_1])$. Thus $R[g] = R[a] \in \langle \alpha_{RS}(X/S) \rangle$. Therefore $\langle \alpha_{RS}(X/S) \rangle = G/R$ and consequently, $\Gamma/T = \Gamma(G/R, X/S)$ is path connected. Hence Γ is cofinitely connected.

Conversely, let us now take Γ to be cofinitely connected. We want to show that $\overline{\langle \alpha(X) \rangle} = G$. So we intend to show that for any g in G and any open set $R[g]$ on $G, R[g] \cap \langle \alpha(X) \rangle \neq \emptyset$. We can form a compatible cofinite entourage $T = R \times S$ where S is a compatible cofinite entourage over X and $S \subseteq (\alpha \times \alpha)^{-1}[R]$. As earlier we can form the Cayley graph $\Gamma/T = \Gamma(G/R, X/S)$ and as Γ is cofinitely connected, Γ/T and therefore $\Gamma(G/R, X/S)$, is path connected. This implies $\langle \alpha_{RS}(X/S) \rangle = G/R$. So there is $e_1, e_2, \cdots, e_n$ in $E(X)$ such that $\alpha_{RS}(S[e_1])\alpha_{RS}(S[e_2])\cdots\alpha_{RS}(S[e_n]) = R[g]$. Thus we can finally say that $\alpha(e_1)\alpha(e_2)\cdots\alpha(e_n) \in R[g]$ which means $\langle \alpha(X) \rangle \cap R[g] \neq \emptyset$ and thus $\overline{\langle \alpha(X) \rangle} = G$. Hence $\alpha\colon X \to G$ topologically generates G. $\square$

4. Groups Acting on Cofinite Graphs

Let G be a group and Γ be a cofinite graph. We say that the group G acts over Γ if and only if

(1) For all x in Γ, for all g in $G, g.x$ is in Γ
(2) For all x in Γ, for all g_1, g_2 in $G, g_1.(g_2.x) = (g_1g_2).x$
(3) For all x in Γ, $1.x = x$
(4) For all v in $V(\Gamma)$, for all g in $G, g.v$ is in $V(\Gamma)$ and for all e in $E(\Gamma)$, for all g in $G, g.e$ is in $E(\Gamma)$.
(5) For all e in $E(\Gamma)$, for all g in $G, g.s(e) = s(g.e), g.t(e) = t(ge), g.(\overline{e}) = \overline{g.e}$
(6) There exists a $G-$invariant orientation $E^+(\Gamma)$ of Γ.

Note that the aforesaid group action restricted to a singleton group element $g \in G$ can be treated as a well defined map of graphs, $\Gamma \to \Gamma$ taking $x \mapsto g.x$.

Definition 4.1. *A group G is said to act uniformly equicontinuously over a cofinite graph Γ, if and only if for each entourage W over Γ there exists an entourage V over Γ such that for all g in $G, (g \times g)[V]$ is a subset of W.*

Lemma 4.2. *If G acts uniformly equicontinuously over a cofinite graph Γ, then there exists a fundamental system of entourages consisting of G-invariant compatible cofinite entourages over Γ, i.e. for any entourage U over Γ there exists a compatible cofinite entourage R over Γ such that for all $g \in G, (g \times g)[R] \subseteq R \subseteq U$.*

Proof. Let U be any cofinite entourage over Γ. Then as G acts uniformly equi continuously over Γ, there exists a compatible cofinite entourage S over Γ such that forall $g \in G, (g \times g)[S] \subseteq U$. Choose a G-invariant orientation $E^+(\Gamma)$ of Γ. Without loss of generality, we can assume that our compatible equivalence relation S on Γ is *orientation preserving* i.e. whenever $(e, e') \in R$ and $e \in E^+(\Gamma)$, then also $e' \in E^+(\Gamma)$. Clearly, $S \subseteq \cup_{g\in G}(g \times g)[S] \subseteq U$. Now if $S_0 = \cup_{g\in G}(g \times g)[S]$ and $T = \langle S_0 \rangle$, note that $S \subseteq T \subseteq U$. Since for all $h \in G, (h \times h)[S_0] = S_0$ and $S_0^{-1} = S_0$ it follows that T is in the transitive closure of S_0. Let $(x, y) \in T$. Then there exists a finite sequence $x_0, x_1, .., x_n$ such that $(x_i, x_{i+1}) \in S_0$, for all $i = 0, 1, 2, ..., n-1$ and $x = x_0, y = x_n$. Hence $(gx_i, gx_{i+1}) \in S_0$, for all $i = 0, 1, 2, ..., n-1$, for all $g \in G$. Thus $(gx_0, gx_n) = (gx, gy) \in T$, for all $g \in G$. Hence for all $g \in G, (g \times g)[T] \subseteq T$ and our claim that T is a G-invariant cofinite entourage, follows. It remains to check that T is compatible. Let $(x, y) \in T$. If $(x, y) \in S_0$, then there is $(t, s) \in S = S_V \cup S_E$ and $g \in G$ such that $(gt, gs) = (x, y)$. Without loss of generality let

$(t,s) \in S_V$. Then $(t,s) \in V(\Gamma) \times V(\Gamma)$ which implies that $(x,y) \in T_V$. Now let $(x,y) \in T \setminus S_0$. Then there exists a finite sequence $x_0, x_1, .., x_n$ such that $(x_i, x_{i+1}) \in S_0$, for all $i = 0, 1, 2, ..., n-1$ and $x = x_0, y = x_n$. Hence by the previous argument if $(x_0, x_1) \in T_V$ then $(x_i, x_{i+1}) \in T_V$, for all $i = 1, 2, ..., n-1$. Thus $(x,y) \in T_V$. If $(x_0, x_1) \in T_E$ then $(x_i, x_{i+1}) \in T_E$, for all $i = 1, 2, ..., n-1$, which implies $(x,y) \in T_E$. Let $(e_1, e_2) \in T$. If $(x,y) \in S_0$, then there is $(p,q) \in S$ and $g \in G$ such that $(gp, gq) = (e_1, e_2)$. Then $(s(p), s(q)) \in S$. So $(s(e_1), s(e_2))$ which equals to $(gs(p), gs(q))$ is in $(g \times g)[S] \subseteq S_0$ so that $(s(e_1), s(e_2)) \in T$. Now let $(e_1, e_2) \in T \setminus S_0$. Then there exists a finite sequence $x_0, x_1, .., x_n$ such that $(x_i, x_{i+1}) \in S_0, \forall i = 0, 1, 2, ..., n-1$ and $e_1 = x_0, e_2 = x_n$. Hence by the previous argument $(s(x_i), s(x_{i+1})) \in T, \forall i = 0, 1, 2, ..., n-1$ and thus $(s(e_1), s(e_2)) \in T$. Similarly, $(t(e_1), t(e_2)) \in T$ and $(\overline{e_1}, \overline{e_2}) \in T$. Finally, to show that for any $e \in E^+(\Gamma), (e\overline{e}) \in T$ it suffices to note that T is orientation preserving. Alternatively, if possible let $(e, \overline{e}) \in T$. If $(e, \overline{e}) \in S_0$, then there is $(p,q) \in S$ and $g \in G$ such that $(gp, gq) = (e, \overline{e})$. Then $\overline{e} = \overline{gp} = g\overline{p} = gq$ which implies that $\overline{p} = q$, so $(p, \overline{p}) \in S$, a contradiction. Now let $(e, \overline{e}) \in T \setminus S_0$. Then there exists a finite sequence $x_0, x_1, .., x_n$ such that $(x_i, x_{i+1}) \in S_0$, for all $i = 0, 1, 2, ..., n-1$ and $e = x_0, \overline{e} = x_n$. Now let there is $(p,q) \in S$ and $g \in G$ such that $(gp, gq) = (x_0, x_1)$. Without loss of generality we may assume $(p,q) \in E^+(\Gamma) \times E^+(\Gamma)$. Then $(gp, gq) = (x_0, x_1) \in E^+(\Gamma) \times E^+(\Gamma)$. Hence $(x_i, x_{i+1}) \in E^+(\Gamma) \times E^+(\Gamma)$, for all $i = 1, 2, ..., n-1$ which implies that $(e, \overline{e}) \in E^+(\Gamma) \times E^+(\Gamma)$, a contradiction. Our claim follows. □

Definition 4.3. *We say a group G acts on a cofinite space Γ faithfully, if for all g in $G \setminus \{1\}$ there exists x in Γ such that gx is not equal to x in Γ.*

Lemma 4.4. *Let G acts on a cofinite graph Γ uniformly equicontinuously. Then G acts on Γ/R and G/N_R acts on Γ/R as well, where R is a G-invariant compatible cofinite entourage over Γ. If $\{R \mid R \in I\}$ is a fundamental system of G-invariant compatible cofinite entourages over Γ, then $\{N_R \mid R \in I\}$ forms a fundamental system of cofinite congruences for some uniformity over G.*

Proof. Let R be a G-invariant compatible cofinite entourage over Γ. Let us define $G \times \Gamma/R \to \Gamma/R$ via $g.R[x] = R[g.x]$, for all $g \in G$, for all $x \in \Gamma$. Now let $R[x] = R[y]$ so $(x,y) \in R$ which implies that $(g.x, g.y) \in R$. Then $R[g.x] = R[g.y]$. Hence the induced group action is well defined.

Let us now consider the group action $G/N_R \times \Gamma/R \to \Gamma/R$, defined via $N_R[g].R[x] = R[g.x]$,for all $x \in \Gamma$, for all $g \in G$. Now let $(N_R[g], R[x]) = (N_R[h], R[y])$ which implies that $(g,h) \in N_R, (x,y)$ is

in R. Then $(g.x, h.x) \in R$, as $h^{-1} \in G, (h^{-1}g.x, h^{-1}h.x) \in R$. So $(h^{-1}g.x, y) \in R$. Thus $(g.x, h.y) \in R$ which implies that $R[g.x]$ equals to $R[h.y]$. Hence the induced group action is well defined. Let us now show that N_R is an equivalence relation over G, for all G-invariant compatible cofinite entourage R over Γ.

(1) for all $g \in G$, for all $x \in \Gamma, (g.x, g.x) \in R$. Hence $(g, g) \in N_R$, for all $g \in G$ which implies that $D(G) \subseteq N_R$.
(2) Now $(h, g) \in N_R^{-1} \Leftrightarrow (g, h) \in N_R \Leftrightarrow (g.x, h.x) \in R$, for all $x \in \Gamma$. Thus $(g.x, h.x) \in R \Leftrightarrow (h.x, g.x) \in R$, for all $x \in \Gamma$. Hence $(h.x, g.x) \in R \Leftrightarrow (h, g) \in N_R$. Thus $N_R^{-1} = N_R$.
(3) Let $(g, h), (h, k) \in N_R$. This implies $(g.x, h.x), (h.x, k.x)$ is in $R, \forall x \in \Gamma$. Hence $(g.x, k.x) \in R$, for all $x \in \Gamma$. So $(g, k) \in N_R$ which implies that $(N_R)^2 \subseteq N_R$.

Also we now check that N_R is a congruence over G. For, let us take $(g_1, g_2), (g_3, g_4) \in N_R$. Then for all $x \in \Gamma, (g_1.x, g_2.x), (g_3.x, g_4.x) \in R$; for all $x \in \Gamma, g_3.x \in \Gamma$ and so $(g_1g_3.x, g_2g_3.x) \in R$ and $(g_2g_3.x, g_2g_4.x)$ is in R, since R is G-invariant. Thus $(g_1g_3.x, g_2g_4.x) \in R$, for all $x \in \Gamma$ so that $(g_1g_3, g_2g_4) \in N_R$. Thus our claim follows. Let us now show that G/N_R is finite. Furthermore, define $g\colon \Gamma/R \to \Gamma/R$ as g maps $(R[x])$ into $R[g.x]$. Now, $R[x] = R[y] \iff (x, y) \in R$ if and only if $(g.x, g.y) \in R \iff R[g.x] = R[g.y]$. Hence the map g is a well defined injection. Now for all $R[x] \in \Gamma/R$ there exists $g^{-1}R[x] \in \Gamma/R$ such that $g(g^{-1}R[x])$ equals to $R[x]$. Hence $g \in Sym(\Gamma/R)$. Now let us define a map $\theta\colon G/N_R \to Sym(\Gamma/R)$ via $\theta(N_R[g]) = g$. Now $N_R[g_1]$ equals to $N_R[g_2]$ if and only if $(g_1, g_2) \in N_R$ if and only if $(g_1.x, g_2.x) \in R$ for all $x \in \Gamma$. Hence $(g_1.x, g_2.x) \in R$ if and only if $R[g_1.x] = R[g_2.x]$ if and only if $g_1(R[x]) = g_2(R[x])$ $g_1 = g_2$ in $Sym(\Gamma/R)$. Hence θ is a well defined injection. Thus $|G/N_R| \leq |Sym(\Gamma/R)| < \infty$ as $|\Gamma/R| < \infty$. So, next we will like to show that $\{N_R \mid R \in I\}$ forms a fundamental system of cofinite congruences over G.

(1) $D(G) \subseteq N_R$, for all $R \in I$, as N_R is reflexive.
(2) Now for some $R, S \in I, (g_1, g_2) \in N_R \bigcap N_S$ if and only if $(g_1.x, g_2.x) \in R \bigcap S$, for all $x \in \Gamma \Leftrightarrow (g_1, g_2) \in N_{R \bigcap S}$. Thus $N_R \bigcap N_S = N_{R \bigcap S}$.
(3) For all $N_R, N_R^2 = N_R$, as N_R is transitive.
(4) For all $N_R, N_R^{-1} = N_R$, as N_R is symmetric.

Hence our claim follows. □

Definition 4.5. *We say that a group G acts on a cofinite graph Γ residually freely, if there exists a fundamental system of G-invariant*

compatible cofinite entourages R over Γ such that the induced group action of G/N_R over Γ/R is a free action.

Lemma 4.6. *$N_R[1]$ is a finite index normal subgroup of G and $G/N_R[1]$ is isomorphic with G/N_R. More generally, if N is a congruence on G, then $N[1]$ is a normal subgroup of G and $G/N[1] \cong G/N$.*

Proof. Let us first see that $N_R[1] \lhd_f G$ for all G-invariant compatible cofinite entourage R over Γ. Let $g, h \in N_R[1]$. This implies $(1, g) \in N_R$ and hence $(g, 1), (1, h) \in N_R$. Thus $(g, h) \in N_R$. This implies $(g.x, h.x)$ is in R, for all $x \in \Gamma$ and so $(x, g^{-1}h.x) \in R$, for all $x \in \Gamma$. Hence, $(1, g^{-1}h)$ is in N_R and thus $g^{-1}h \in N_R[1]$. So, $N_R[1] \leq G$. For all $g \in G$, for all $x \in \Gamma, g.x \in \Gamma$. Hence for all $k \in N_R[1], (x, k.x) \in R$, hence $(k.x, x)$ is in R. Thus $(kg.x, g.x) \in R$ and $(g^{-1}kg.x, g^{-1}g.x) = (g^{-1}kg.x, x) \in R$. Hence $(g^{-1}kg, 1) \in N_R$. So, $g^{-1}kg \in N_R[1]$ and thus $N_R[1] \lhd G$. Now let us define η from $G/N_R[1]$ to G/N_R via $\eta(gN_R[1]) = N_R[g]$. Then, $gN_R[1]$ is equal to $hN_R[1]$ if and only if $h^{-1}g \in N_R[1]$ if and only if $(1, h^{-1}g) \in N_R$ if and only if $(x, h^{-1}g.x) \in R$ if and only if $(h.x, g.x) \in R$ if and only if $(h, g) \in N_R$ if and only if $N_R[h] = N_R[g]$, for all x in Γ. Thus η is a well defined injection and hence $|G/N_R[1]| \leq |G/N_R| < \infty$. Hence $N_R[1] \lhd_f G$. Let us check that G/N_R is a group. For, let $N_R[g_i]$ is in $G/N_R, i = 1, 2$. Then $N_R[g_1]N_R[g_2] = N_R[g_1g_2] \in G/N_R$. Let $N_R[g_i]$ in G/N_R, for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then $(N_R[g_1]N_R[g_2])N_R[g_3]$ which is equal to $N_R[g_1g_2]N_R[g_3]$ and that equals to $N_R[g_1g_2g_3] = N_R[g_1]N_R[g_2g_3]$ which is equal to $N_R[g_1](N_R[g_2]N_R[g_3])$. For all $N_R[g] \in G/N_R$, there exists $N_R[1]$ in G/N_R, such that $N_R[1]N_R[g] = N_R[g] = N_R[g]N_R[1]$. For all $N_R[g]$ in G/N_R, there exists $N_R[g^{-1}]$ in G/N_R, such that $N_R[g^{-1}]N_R[g]$ equals to $N_R[g^{-1}g] = N_R[1] = N_R[gg^{-1}] = N_R[g]N_R[g^{-1}]$. Hence our claim. Now let us define $\zeta\colon G/N_R[1] \to G/N_R$ via $\zeta(gN_R[1]) = N_R[g]$. Then for g_1, g_2 in $G, g_1N_R[1] = g_2N_R[1]$ if and only if $g_2^{-1}g_1 \in N_R[1]$ if and only if $(1, g_2^{-1}g_1) \in N_R$ if and only if $(x, g_2^{-1}g_1.x) \in R$ if and only if $(g_2.x, g_1.x) \in R$ if and only if $(g_2, g_1) \in N_R$ if and only if $N_R[g_2]$ equals to $N_R[g_1]$. Hence ζ is a well defined injection. Also for all $N_R[g]$ in G/N_R, there exists $gN_R[1] \in G/N_R[1]$ such that $\zeta(gN_R[1]) = N_R[g]$. Thus ζ is surjective as well. Also for $g_1N_R[1], g_2N_R[1] \in G/N_R[1]$, we have $\zeta(g_1N_R[1]g_2N_R[1]) = \zeta(g_1g_2N_R[1])$ and that equals to $N_R[g_1g_2]$ which equals to $N_R[g_1]N_R[g_2] = \zeta(g_1N_R[1])\zeta(g_2N_R[1])$. Hence ζ is a group homomorphism and thus a group isomorphism. Also, both $G/N_R[1], G/N_R$, are finite discrete topological groups, so ζ is an isomorphism of uniform cofinite groups as well. □

Lemma 4.7. *The induced uniform topology over G as in Lemma 4.4 is Hausdorff if and only if G acts faithfully over Γ.*

Proof. Let us first assume that G acts faithfully over Γ. Now let $g \neq h$ in G. Then $h^{-1}g \neq 1$. So there exists $x \in \Gamma$ such that $h^{-1}g.x \neq x$ implying that $g.x \neq h.x$. Then there exists a G-invariant compatible cofinite entourage R over Γ such that $(g.x, h.x) \notin R$, as Γ is Hausdorff. Hence $(g, h) \notin N_R$. Thus G is Hausdorff.

Conversely, let us assume that G is Hausdorff and let $g \neq 1$ in G. Then there exists some G-invariant compatible cofinite entourage R over Γ such that $(1, g) \notin N_R$. Hence there exists $x \in \Gamma$ such that $(x, g.x) \notin R$. Hence $R[x] \neq R[g.x]$ so that $x \neq g.x$. Our claim follows. □

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose that G is a group acting uniformly equicontinuously on a cofinite graph Γ and give G the induced uniformity as in Lemma 4.4. Then the action $G \times \Gamma \to \Gamma$ is uniformly continuous.*

Proof. Let R be a G-invariant cofinite entourage over Γ. Now let $((g, x), (h, y)) \in N_R \times R$, i.e. $(g, h) \in N_R, (x, y) \in R$. Now x in Γ and $(gx, hx) \in R$ this implies $(h^{-1}gx, x) \in R$. We have $(h^{-1}gx, y) \in R$ and hence $(gx, hy) \in R$. Thus our claim. □

Now if $R \leq S$ in I, then $S \subseteq R$. Let $(g_1, g_2) \in N_S$. Then $(g_1x, g_2x) \in S$, for all $x \in \Gamma$ and hence $(g_1x, g_2x) \in R$,for all $x \in \Gamma$ which implies $(g_1, g_2) \in N_R$. Thus $N_S \subseteq N_R$. For all $R \leq S$, in I, let us define $\psi_{RS} \colon G/N_S \to G/N_R$ via $\psi_{RS}(N_S[g]) = N_R[g]$. Then ψ_{RS} is a well defined uniformly continuous group isomorphism, as each of $G/N_R, G/N_S$ are finite discrete groups. If $R = S$, then $\psi_{RR} = id_{G/N_R}$. And if $R \leq S \leq T$, then $\psi_{RS}\psi_{ST} = \psi_{RT}$. Then $\{G/N_R \mid R \in I, \psi_{RS}, R \leq S \in I\}$, forms an inverse system of finite discrete groups. Let $\widehat{\Gamma} = \varprojlim_{R \in I} \Gamma/R$ and $\widehat{G} = \varprojlim_{R \in I} G/N_R$, where $\psi_R \colon \widehat{G} \to G/N_R$ is the corresponding canonical projection map. Now if I_1, I_2 are two fundamental systems of G-invariant cofinite entourages over Γ, clearly I_1, I_2 will form fundamental systems of cofinite congruences, for two induced uniformities, over G. Now let N_{R_1} be a cofinite congruence over G for some $R_1 \in I_1$. Then there exists a R_2, cofinite entourage over Γ, such that $R_2 \in I_2$ and $R_2 \subseteq R_1$. Hence $N_{R_2} \subseteq N_{R_1}$. Now let N_{S_2} be a cofinite congruence over G for some $S_2 \in I_2$. Then there exists S_1, cofinite entourage over Γ, such that $S_1 \in I_1$ and $S_1 \subseteq S_2$. Hence $N_{S_1} \subseteq N_{S_2}$. Thus any cofinite congruence corresponding to the directed set I_1 is a cofinite congruence corresponding to the directed set I_2 and vice versa. Thus the two induced uniform structures over G are equivalent and so the completion of G with respect to the induced uniformity, from the cofinite graph Γ, is unique up to both algebraic and topological isomorphism.

Theorem 4.9. *If G acts on Γ, as in Lemma 4.4, faithfully then $\widehat{G}$ acts on $\widehat{\Gamma}$ uniformly equicontinuously.*

Proof. The group G acts on Γ uniformly equicontinuously. We fix a G-invariant orientation $E^+(\Gamma)$ of Γ. By Lemma 4.8 the action is uniformly continuous as well. Let $\chi\colon G \times \Gamma \to \Gamma$ be this group action. Now since Γ is topologically embedded in $\widehat{\Gamma}$ by the inclusion map, say, i, the map $i \circ \chi\colon G \times \Gamma \to \widehat{\Gamma}$ is a uniformly continuous. Then there exists a unique uniformly continuous map $\widehat{\chi}\colon \widehat{G} \times \widehat{\Gamma} \to \widehat{\Gamma}$ that extends χ. We claim that $\widehat{\chi}$ is the required group action. We can take $\widehat{\Gamma} = \varprojlim \Gamma/R$ and $\widehat{G} = \varprojlim G/N_R$, where R runs throughout all G-invariant compatible cofinite entourages of Γ that are orientation preserving. Then $\widehat{G} \times \widehat{\Gamma} = \varprojlim(G/N_R \times \Gamma/R)$ and $G \times \Gamma$ is defined coordinatewise via $(N_R[g_R])_R.(R[x_R])_R = (R[g_R.x_R])_R$. If possible let, $((N_R[g_R])_R, (R[x_R])_R) = ((N_R[h_R])_R, (R[y_R])_R)$. So, $N_R[g_R]$ equals to $N_R[h_R]$ and $R[x_R] = R[y_R], \forall R \in I, (g_R, h_R) \in N_R$ and $(x_R, y_R) \in R$. This implies that $(g_R.x_R, h_R.x_R) \in R$ which further ensures that $(h_R^{-1}g_R.x_R, x_R) \in R$. Then $(h_R^{-1}g_R.x_R, y_R) \in R$ and $(g_R.x_R, h_R.y_R) \in R$. Hence $(R[g_R.x_R])_R = (R[h_R.y_R])_R$. So, the action is well defined. Let $g = (N_R[g_R])_R$ and $h = (N_R[h_R])_R$ in $\widehat{G}$, $x = (R[x_R])_R \in \widehat{\Gamma}$. Now $h.(g.x) = h.(R[g_R.x_R])_R = (R[h_R g_R.x_R])_R$ which then equals to$(N_R[h_R g_R])_R.x = (hg).x$. Hence the action is associative. Now $(N_R[1])_R.(R[x_R])_R = (R[1x_R])_R = (R[x_R])_R$. Furthermore for all v equal to $(R[v_R])_R \in V(\widehat{\Gamma})$ and for all g equal to $(N_R[g_R])_R \in \widehat{G}$ one can say that $g.v = (R[g_R.v_R])_R \in V(\widehat{\Gamma})$ as each $g_R.v_R \in V(\Gamma)$. Similarly, for all e equal to $(R[e_R])_R$ in $E(\widehat{\Gamma})$ and for all g equal to $(N_R[g_R])_R$ in $\widehat{G}$, $g.e = (R[g_R e_R])_R$ in $E(\widehat{\Gamma})$. For all e equal to $(R[e_R])_R$ in $E(\widehat{\Gamma})$, for all g equal to $(N_R[g_R])_R$ in $\widehat{G}$, we have $s(g.e) = s((R[g_R e_R])_R)$ and so $(R[g_R s(e_R)])_R$ equals to $(g.(R[s(e_R)])_R$ and that equals to $g.s(e)$. Hence the properties $t(g.e) = g.t(e)$ and $\overline{g.e} = g.\overline{e}$ follow similarly. Finally, let $E^+(\widehat{\Gamma})$ consists of all the edges $(R[e_R])_R$, where $e_R \in E^+(\Gamma)$. Since each R is orientation preserving, it follows that $E^+(\widehat{\Gamma})$ is an orientation of $\widehat{\Gamma}$. Since $E^+(\Gamma)$ is G-invariant, we see that $E^+(\widehat{\Gamma})$ is $\widehat{\Gamma}$-invariant. Hence this is a well defined group action. Also for all $g \in G$, and $x \in \Gamma$, $(N_R[g])_R.(R[x])_R$ equals to $(R[g.x])_R$ which equals to $g.x$ in Γ. Thus the restriction of this group action agrees with the group action χ. Now $\{R \mid R \in I\}, \{N_R \mid R \in I\}$ is a fundamental system of cofinite entourages over Γ, is a fundamental system of cofinite congruences over G. Hence $\{\overline{R} \mid R \in I\}$ is a fundamental system of cofinite entourages over $\widehat{\Gamma}$ and $\{\overline{N_R} \mid R \in I\}$

is a fundamental system of cofinite congruences over $\widehat{G}$ respectively. Let us now see that the aforesaid group action is uniformly continuous. For let us consider the group action $G/N_R \times \Gamma/R \to \Gamma/R$ defined via $N_R[g]R[x] = R[g.x]$, which is uniformly continuous as both $G/N_R \times \Gamma/R$ and Γ/R are finite discrete uniform topological spaces. Hence the group action, $\widehat{G} \times \widehat{\Gamma} \to \widehat{\Gamma}$ is uniformly continuous. Thus the aforesaid group action is our choice of $\widehat{\chi}$, by the uniqueness of $\widehat{\chi}$. So the restriction of the aforesaid action $\{\widehat{g}\} \times \widehat{\Gamma} \to \widehat{\Gamma}$ is a uniformly continuous map of graphs, for all $\widehat{g} \in \widehat{G}$. We check that for all $(x, y) \in R$ and for all $\widehat{g} \in \widehat{G}$ the ordered pair $(\widehat{g}.x, \widehat{g}.y) \in \overline{R}$. For, let $\widehat{g} = (N_R[g_R])_R \in \widehat{G}$ and for $x, y \in \Gamma, ((R[x])_R, (R[y])_R) \in R$. Now $\overline{R}[(R[g_R.x])_R] = \overline{R}[g_R.x]$ becomes equal to $\overline{R}[g_R.y] = \overline{R}[(R[g_R.y])_R]$. So, $((N_R[g_R])_R(R[x])_R, (N_R[g_R])_R(R[y])_R) \in \overline{R}$. This implies $(\widehat{g} \times \widehat{g})[R]$ is a subset of $\overline{R}$. Thus for all $\widehat{g} \in \widehat{G}$ we observe that $(\widehat{g} \times \widehat{g})[\overline{R}]$ is a sub set of $\overline{\widehat{g} \times \widehat{g}[R]}$ which is a sub set of $\overline{\overline{R}} = \overline{R}$. Hence $\overline{R}$ is $\widehat{G}$ invariant. $\square$

Thus $\Phi_1 = \{N_{\overline{R}} \mid R \in I\}$ and $\Phi_2 = \{\overline{N_R} \mid R \in I\}$ form fundamental systems of cofinite congruences over $\widehat{G}$. Let $\tau_{\Phi_1}, \tau_{\Phi_2}$ be the topologies induced by Φ_1, Φ_2 respectively.

Theorem 4.10. *The uniformities on $\widehat{G}$ obtained by Φ_1 and Φ_2 are equivalent.*

Proof. Let us first show that $N_{\overline{R}} \cap G \times G = N_R$. For, let $(g, h) \in N_R$. Then for all $x \in \Gamma, (g.x, h.x) \in R \subseteq \overline{R}$. Now let $(R[x_R])_R \in \widehat{\Gamma}$. Then $\overline{R}[g(R[x_R])_R] = \overline{R}[g.x_R] = \overline{R}[h.x_R] = \overline{R}[h(R[x_R])_R]$ which implies that $(g, h) \in N_{\overline{R}} \cap G \times G$. Thus, $N_R \subseteq N_{\overline{R}} \cap G \times G$. Again, if (g, h) belongs to $N_{\overline{R}} \cap G \times G$, then for all $x \in \Gamma \subseteq \widehat{\Gamma}$, and so $(g.x, h.x) \in \overline{R} \cap \Gamma \times \Gamma = R$ and this implies $(g, h) \in N_R$. Our claim follows. Then as uniform subgraphs $(G, \tau_{\Phi_1}) \cong (G, \tau_{\Phi_2})$, both algebraically and topologically, their corresponding completions $(\widehat{G}, \tau_{\Phi_1}) \cong (\widehat{G}, \tau_{\Phi_2})$, both algebraically and topologically. Since for all $S \in I$, $\psi_S \colon G \to G/N_S$ is a uniform continuous group homomorphism and G/N_S is discrete, there exists a unique uniform continuous extension of ψ_S, namely, $\widehat{\psi_S} \colon \widehat{G} \to G/N_S$. Let us define $\lambda_S \colon \widehat{G} \to G/N_S$ via $\lambda_S(g) = N_S[g_S]$, where $g = (N_R[g_R])_R$. Now let $g = (N_R[g_R])_R, h = (N_R[h_R])_R \in \widehat{G}$ be such that $g = h$ which implies that $N_S[g_S] = N_S[h_S]$ and hence λ_S is well defined. Now let $(g, h) \in N_{\overline{S}}$. First of all $N_{\overline{S}}[g_S] = N_{\overline{S}}[g] = N_{\overline{S}}[h] = N_{\overline{S}}[h_S]$. So, $(g_S, h_S) \in N_{\overline{S}} \bigcap G \times G = N_S$. Hence $N_S[g_S] = N_S[h_S]$ which implies that $\lambda_S(g) = \lambda_S(h)$, so $(\lambda_S(g), \lambda_S(h)) \in D(G/N_R)$. Thus $N_{\overline{S}}$ is a sub set of $(\lambda_S \times \lambda_S)^{-1} D(G/N_R)$. Hence λ_S is uniformly continuous. Now for

all $g, h \in \widehat{G}, \lambda_S(gh) = N_S[g_S h_S] = N_S[g_S]N_S[h_S] = \lambda_S(g)\lambda_S(h)$ and for all $g \in G, \lambda_S(g) = \lambda_S((N_R[g])_R) = N_S[g] = \psi_S(g)$. Thus λ_S is an well defined uniformly continuous group homomorphism that extends ψ_S. Then by the uniqueness of the extension, $\widehat{\psi_S} = \lambda_S$. Now $N_{\overline{S}}$ is a closed subspace of $\widehat{G}$, then $\overline{N_{\overline{S}} \cap G \times G} = \overline{N_S}$ which implies that $\overline{N_S}$ is a sub set of $\overline{N_{\overline{S}}}$ which equals to $N_{\overline{S}}$. Let us define θ from $\widehat{G}/N_{\overline{S}}$ to G/N_S as θ takes $N_{\overline{S}}[g]$ into $N_S[g_S]$, where $g = (N_R[g_R])_R$. Now $N_{\overline{S}}[g] = N_{\overline{S}}[h]$ in $\widehat{G}/N_{\overline{S}}$ will imply (g_S, h_S) is in $N_{\overline{S}}$ and this implies for all x in X the ordered pair $(g_S x, h_S x)$ is in $\overline{S} \bigcap \Gamma \times \Gamma$ which is eventually equal to S. Thus $(g_S, h_S) \in N_S$. Then $\theta(N_{\overline{S}}[g])$ equals to $N_S[g_S]$ which is equal to $N_S[h_S]$ and that equals $\theta(N_{\overline{S}}[h])$. Hence θ is well defined. On the other hand let $N_{\overline{S}}[g]$, $N_{\overline{S}}[h]$ be such that $\theta(N_{\overline{S}}[g])$ equals $\theta(N_{\overline{S}}[h])$. Thus $N_S[g_S]$ equal to $N_S[h_S]$ implies that $(g_S, h_S) \in N_S \subseteq N_{\overline{S}}$. Hence $N_{\overline{S}}[g] = N_{\overline{S}}[g_S] = N_{\overline{S}}[h_S] = N_{\overline{S}}[h]$. So, θ is injective as well. Also for all $N_S[g] \in G/N_S$ there exists $N_{\overline{S}}[g] \in \widehat{G}/N_{\overline{S}}$ such that $\theta(N_{\overline{S}}[g]) = N_S[g]$. So θ is surjective. Finally, $\theta(N_{\overline{S}}[g]N_{\overline{S}}[h])$ equals to $\theta(N_{\overline{S}}[gh])$ and that equals to $N_S[g_S h_S]$ which is $N_S[g_S]N_S[h_S]$ and finally that equals to $\theta(N_{\overline{S}}[g])\theta(N_{\overline{S}}[h])$. So θ is an well defined group isomorphism, both algebraically and topologically. Hence $\widehat{G}/N_{\overline{S}} \cong G/N_S \cong \widehat{G}/\overline{N_S}$ which implies that $\left|\widehat{G}/N_{\overline{S}}[1]\right|$ is equal to $\left|\widehat{G}/\overline{N_S}[1]\right|$. But since $\overline{N_S} \subseteq N_{\overline{S}}$ one obtains $\overline{N_S}[1] \leq N_{\overline{S}}[1] \leq \widehat{G}$ and thus $\left|\widehat{G}/N_{\overline{S}}[1]\right| \left|N_{\overline{S}}[1] : \overline{N_S}[1]\right|$ equals to $\left|\widehat{G}/\overline{N_S}[1]\right|$. Hence $\left|N_{\overline{S}}[1] : \overline{N_S}[1]\right| = 1$ which implies that $N_{\overline{S}}[1] = \overline{N_S}[1]$ and thus $N_{\overline{S}} = \overline{N_S}$ as each of them are congruences. Thus our claim. □

References

1. N. Bourbaki, *General Topology*, Elements of Mathematics, Addison-Wesley, Reading Mass., 1966.
2. B. Hartley, *Profinite and residually finite groups*, Rocky Mountain J. Math **7** (1977), 193–217.
3. J. Kelley, *General Topology*, D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., Toronto-New York-London, 1955.
4. J.-P. Serre, *Trees*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1980.
5. J. R. Stallings, *Topology of finite graphs*, Invent. Math. **71** (1983), 551–565.
6. J. Wilson, *Profinite Groups*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1998.
7. B. Das, *Cofinite Graphs and Their Profinite Completions*, proquest, acumen.lib.ua.edu, 2013.
8. P. A. Zalesskii, *Geometric characterization of free constructions of profinite groups*, Siberian Math J. **30** (1989), 227–235.

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Toledo, Main Campus, Toledo, OH 43606-3390
E-mail address: Amrita.Acharyya@utoledo.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0350
E-mail address: jcorson@ua.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of North Georgia, Gainesville Campus, Oakwood, Ga. 30566
E-mail address: Bikash.Das@ung.edu